ORAL HISTORY OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

INTERVIEWS WITH

A. J. GRAY

BY - CHARLES W. CRAWFORD

TRANSCRIBER - BETTY WILLIAMS

ORAL HISTORY RESEARCH OFFICE

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY

BRISTER LIBRARY
This book printed
and bound
through a gift
from
Major Ben K.
and Kathleen J. Schultze.
MISSISSIPPI VALLEY COLLECTION
MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY
1912

26238158 OHT 7/20/92

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES

MVC
TC
425
T2
G727x
1974

UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS LIBRARIES

3 2109 00699 6624

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
LYRASIS Members and Sloan Foundation

http://archive.org/details/oralhistoryoften00gray

ORAL HISTORY OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

INTERVIEWS WITH A. J. GRAY

DECEMBER 20, 1974

BY CHARLES W. CRAWFORD

TRANSCRIBER - BETTY WILLIAMS

ORAL HISTORY RESEARCH OFFICE

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY

ORAL HISTORY RESEARCH OFFICE

I hereby release all right, title, or interest in and to all of my tape-recorded memoirs to the Mississippi Valley Archives of the John Willard Brister Library of Memphis State University and declare that they may be used without any restriction whatsoever and may be copyrighted and published by the said Archives, which also may assign said copyright and publication rights to serious research scholars.

PLACE Knoxville, Tennessee

DATE December 20, 1974

Aelred J. Gray
(Interviewee)

Charles W. Crawford
(For the Mississippi Valley Archives of the John Willard Brister Library of Memphis State University)

(OHRC Form B)

THIS IS THE ORAL HISTORY RESEARCH OFFICE OF MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY. THIS PROJECT IS THE "ORAL HISOTRY OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY." THE DATE IS DECEMBER 20, 1974. THE PLACE IS KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE. THE INTERVIEW IS WITH MR. A. J. GRAY FORMERLY WITH THE TVA. THE INTERVIEW IS BY DR. CHARLES W. CRAWFORD, THE DIRECTOR OF THE ORAL HISTORY RESEARCH OFFICE OF MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY. TRANSCRIBED BY BETTY WILLIAMS. INTERVIEW #1.

DR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Gray I suggest we start by getting some background about you--a brief biography would suffice, I believe.

MR.GRAY: Well, I was born in Warren, Pennsylvania, and I went to public schools there and when it came time to go to college I spent my first year at Notre Dame and then the last three years were spent at the University of Michigan where I got my A. B. Degree in geography. This was kind of a bad time to graduate from college, as you know, and after looking for a job and not finding one I decided to go on for my master's degree. So I got a scholarship from Syracuse University and I had just about completed my work on my degree there. I had completed all the course work, but I had not completed the thesis requirement, and I got a call from some of my old Michigan collegues who were here at TVA, Glendinning and Otto Guthe who had been at Michigan when I was there and who were getting their Ph.D.'s So I remember in the dead of winter I left Syracuse in a 1923 Buick and drove down here to Knoxville. Really, it was the first time I had been

much out of the Northern part of the United States. This was my first experience in the South. I should say that when I came down here I really expected to come down for one year and then to go on for my Ph. D. But time has a way of changing the way people react to circumstances. I didn't know really what I was getting into and the really exciting times we had in those days. So really I spent nearly all of my professional career, I would have to say, with TVA. There were a few exceptions. I was loaned for several years to the Alabama State Planning Board--three years, as a matter of fact--by TVA to help them set up a local planning assistance program. I also took a leave of absence from TVA and worked on the Hurricane Rehabilitation Program in New York State. I did a similar job in North Carolina. So I guess you would have to say, that all of my professional career was spent with TVA.

DR. CRAWFORD: What was the year you were born, Mr. Gray?

MR. GRAY: I was born April 20, 1909.

DR. CRAWFORD: What year did you graduate at Michigan?

MR. GRAY: Nineteen hundred and thirty-three. I should tell you that I did finally go back to Syracuse and finish my thesis while I was working here with TVA and then I went back for my orals and finally got the degree in 1937. So there was a time span there, but I certainly learned my lesson, because I am teaching a little bit now at the University and always my advice to students is stay with the university--don't go away without that thesis. Because you are going to have a hard time finishing it.

DR. CRAWFORD: That's the advice I give students too.

Can you tell me how you spell the names of your friends' last names, Glendinning and Guthe?

MR. GRAY: Glendinning, and I can't remember what his first name was--it has been so long ago. But his last name was spelled, G-L-E-D-I-N-N-I-N-G. Otto's name of course, O-T-T-O and the last name, G-U-T-H-E.

DR. CRAWFORD: What conditions did you find when you first arrived in Knoxville in 1935?

MR. GRAY: Well, I was a young man just out of school or about to get out of school and I came down here and I never had been in this area before. I reported in for work on February 18, 1935, and I was in the what was then called the Division of Land Planning and Housing. More specifically, I was in the Division of Land Planning, that was headed by G.Donald Hudson. As a matter of fact, he is still living. He left TVA and went to Northwestern and then went to the University of Washington in Seattle and he is still living there. I talked to him not so long ago, as a matter of fact. He headed up the Land Planning Section.

DR. CRAWFORD: Do you know how long Mr. Hudson was with TVA?

MR. GRAY: Yes, Don was with TVA from a little before I came, as a matter of fact. He probably came in 1934. I would say that he was here until about 1938 or '39. Sometime in there is when he left. To get back to the story, I was assigned to the Land Planning Housing Division and so when I reported, they told me to report to Dandridge because I was being assigned to a field party that would work in Pickwick. Well, I looked on all the maps and I couldn't find Pickwick any place. So I took this old car and left it out in Dandridge

and we took off in the TVA car heading west and I soon found out that Pickwick was on the lower Tennessee near Savannah, Tennessee. Our job there, which was an interesting job, was one of making a survey of land uses along the reservoir and interviewing the people who were within the flood zone and making recommendations for the taking line along the reservoir. We spent all of that year, as a matter of fact, working on that particular project. This was one of the activities that we were very closely related to--this whole survey of reservoir shore lines and the development of some kinds of recommendations for land acquisition.

After that assignment I was pulled back into Knoxville because something that most people in TVA don't even remember anymore was that the Land Planning Division was starting what was then called the Rural Land Classification Survey. You, probably, if you have talked to some of the early people, will have some records of that. Certainly Harold Miller and I were the two of us that were closely associated with this and were with the project as long as it lasted. Essentially what this was was a survey method by automobile--a kind of reconnaissance survey--and it looked at the land to find out how it was used and what the characteristics of the land itself were.

Now the reason for this broad survey was that you have to remember that in 1935 you didn't have the data that we now have about the Valley. This was to be a rapid survey in order to find some kind of basis for program planning. The data that came out of these surveys were put together in various combinations to recommend such things as what areas ought to be served and common service areas for the power program and

where were the poor agricultural lands were and where should the fertilizer program be concentrated. These sorts of recommendations came out of that work.

The RLCS had a really interesting history because it was one of the first attempts made in this country for a broad scale reconnaissance survey of land use. I have to tell you about the controversy in back of it because it was through this that the program was stopped.

As a part of that survey, you must remember that we were all geographers not agronomists. One part of that survey called for a general estimate of what was termed in the legend, productivity. Well, some of the agricultural people in TVA, as did some of the soils people in the Department of Agriculture, objected to geographers making this kind of an interpretation. So utilizing the fact that we were not supposed to be knowledgeable in this area, although I'm not so sure for the general type of appraisal we were making,this wasn't perfectly adequate. Finally, about the time that Mr. Hudson left, 1938 or 1939, the survey was stopped and as a matter of fact shortly after that, Mr. Sturdivant, who was the head of the Information Office here, made a ruling that information could no longer be released to the outside. But you know, the geographers always were intrigued by that survey method and fortunately at least some of us interested in it kept holding all the research material together. And as a matter of fact, in the last two years before I did retire I worked with our people down at Property Supply so we have all of that old RLCS material that had been held together over the years down in our files here. That is now down in the archives in Atlanta so that geographers throughout the country who want to do research on that early work can find it all down there and it will be readily accessible

to anybody who wanted to work on it.

DR. CRAWFORD: How extensive are those records, Mr. Gray?

MR. GRAY: Well, we covered on the old RLCS and, yes, don't forget that we are talking about 1935 or 1936, we covered roughly three-fourths of the Valley. We covered all of Alabama, most of Tennessee, a part of Virginia, although we did not get up to the Marion area. We did not cover all of North Carolina. So the major part of the Valley is covered by this survey and[it] is a record of what the land use was in the Valley in that 1935-1936 period. And it will be a valuable piece of research material some day.

DR. CRAWFORD: What sort of material was in that survey?

MR. GRAY: Well, it was based on a kind of numerical fraction in which the numerator listed what kind of farming there was in the area, what the special crops were, what the farmsteads were like, and how large the fields were. The denominator was entirely based on the physical characteristics; the slope of the land, the amount of erosion, the amount of stoniness, and that thing that finally did us in--the productivity. These were broad classes, one to five. All of them had one to five and you could sit down and read this and get a pretty good understanding of what was there.

DR. CRAWFORD: How did you estimate the productivity of the land?

MR. GRAY: Well, we normally looked at the crops. Did they seem to be doing well? Or did they look like scrawny little stalks of corn as some of that North Alabama was in those days. The cotton might have been not more than eight to ten inches

high with a couple of cotton bolls on it before they start really getting production from some of those lands. So this was an interesting history, I think, and an interesting part of TVA's contribution to this whole area of land-use planning.

DR. CRAWFORD: Did you by any chance have any consultation or dealing with Mr. John McAmis about this?

MR. GRAY: Oh yes. Mr. McAmis of course, was the one who felt that the kind of survey--broad survey--that we were undertaking was just inappropriate. You've got to remember though, Mr. McAmis came up through the Extension Service and his whole background was one of a very strong belief that really the only kind of planning that was necessary was the consultation with the people on the farms, and that all the good thing in life came out of this sort of thing. The idea that there could be a broad program planning at a central administrative level--it was quite foreign to him. So his opposition to this particular program was very understandable. Of course, he also had access to H.A. Morgan from his own association at the University and so he was very instrumental in having this whole program kind of put under wraps.

DR. CRAWFORD: How many people do you suppose you had working on it and for what period of time? It seems you have rather complete records.

MR. GRAY: Well, I would say that first of all we were broken up into teams and there were two people to a car. I would say that we had five cars operating in the Valley. We are talk-

ing about roughly ten staff people. We had back-up staff for drafting--putting the field notes that we had into good order. All told I would say we had about twelve people, two back-up people in the office and then the ten people who were working in the field.

DR. CRAWFORD: Do you know how long or extensive the records of this survey are that are stored in Atlanta? Do you know what volume there would be approximately?

MR. GRAY: No, I don't. But all of the areas that were covered are down there. I should say that there are some other interesting records down there. As I was digging through those materials to try to get them in order to send them to Atlanta we found a survey that was the basis for the Rural Land Classification and that was what was known in those days as the cross section. Now this was a field by field survey of land use right across the great Valley from the Cumberland Plateau to the Smokey Mountains and it cut right the grain of the Valley in the neighborhood of Dandridge, I think. It was a mile-wide strip going right across the whole Valley. I should say one thing that I neglected to mention was that the survey was made with aerial photographs. The cross-section was made with detailed photographs and the people who were surveying that and (I was not a part of that) actually surveyed field by field making a record of the crops that were on them and the characteristics of the soil and the land itself. When we got to the RLCS we used the old multiplex aerial photographs that had been put together very rapidly and were at a scale of, 1 inch equals 2000 feet, as I remember. By comparing patterns that were on the aerial photographs we could pretty much indicate and show the areas that had similar kinds of land use. So I should say too that this was a very

broad survey. We would never use units of less than 200 acres so we were talking about trying to get a broad picture of land use--we were not trying to get a detailed survey of the land itself.

DR. CRAWFORD: When did you stop this survey approximately?

MR. GRAY: I'd say it was stopped about 1938 or 1939. Those were the times it was stopped. Shortly thereafter, I would say around 1940, it was no longer used within TVA for the reason I told you about.

DR. CRAWFORD: Let's go back a moment Mr. Gray, to your first work at Pickwick. Once you did find the place, what was the state of construction at the time and what accomodations did you get? I know you had to stay over there.

MR. GRAY: Well, we found an office upstairs of a store on the main street there in Savannah and I remember that we lived in a private home--the Walkers'. They, as a matter of fact, owned a lot of the land in the Pickwick area and this was a typical southern home. Mrs. Walker--we were all kind of young, you know;we were in our twenties--she had great meals for us and treated us as almost one of the family. I remember all the years that she was living whenever I would get down in Savannah I would always go back and see Mrs. Walker. Mr. Walker died a few years after we left there, but Mrs. Walker held the family together and she lived there in Savannah for many many years.

But I think the things [you see] as you drive over the Valley now, you see the green and you see the cattle, but in 1935 this was different. I am sure that most people have told you the same thing--the huge scars of erosion. I still remember a few of them. And every time that I go through those areas I still look over there to see if that erosion is ever going to come back. I remember one area was right outside of

Kingston. On theleft bank as you come across the old bridge there was a steep slope over there and that whole slope was absolutely a bad land topography. Another area was between here and Dandridge and that area was planted in locust quite early and now, as a matter of fact, is back in cultivation again. So all over the Valley was the open farming, the erosion, the unpainted farmsteads. Poverty was evident. The only thing about the area was the scrub cattle over the area. You know they had these scrub jersey bulls running wild almost. These were the ones that were giving character to the cattle in the area. I think it is to the real credit of the Ag people of the way that they did give help to this area not only to improve the farm practices, but to raise the quality of life and to improve the cattle. Now you drive over the Valley--I guess every time I see a nice herd of Black Angus I always think back to what it was in those days. There has been a tremendous improvement, because there is one thing about the Valley that you must remember. It is made up of parts of states that were really kind of orphans. North Alabama, you know, was an orphan in so far that real political control was in South Alabama. East Tennessee, real political control was in Middle and West Tennessee. Southwest Virginia is still an orphan politically. Western North Carolina is a political orphan of the state. So this was an area that hadn't had the public expenditures that some of the other parts of the states had. North Alabama--it's hard to think about it now--but the first time I drove across North Alabama there was only a dirt road. It's hard to imagine that just a few years ago that's all the kind of transportation there was across North Alabama. Now it's a blooming urban area.

DR. CRAWFORD: How did you select the taking line at Pickwick?

MR. GRAY: Well, we put this on the basis of we tried to make estimates of where it would do the least harm to the individuals whose land was there. We also tried to make some preliminary estimates and this was also to become the basis of the future plans for reservoir development. Where were the areas that might be suitable for recreation or for other kinds of usage? These were kind of primitive studies in terms of what we did in later years. but nevertheless it was a beginning to try to think through the future of the reservoirs and how they would be related to the development of the area. What lands ought to be required in order to carry out these plans? So we made the recommendation. Bob Friarson was the one, of course, who actually set the taking line. We were one of the groups making recommendations to him and he had the responsibility for making the final taking line. I'm sure you have probably interviewed Bob. He was with the Maps and Surveys at that time.

Maybe this is another area that we could talk about, by the way, because I think there has been an interesting evolution in what TVA did in regard to plans for reservoir development.

DR. CRAWFORD: What changes have taken place?

MR. GRAY: As I told you, I guess I was associated all of my career within TVA with the community and regional planning groups within TVA. This group had always felt that not only should you plan in advance for what kinds of uses might be appropriate along the reservoir shoreline so that the reservoir itself could contribute the most to the region, but we also felt there ought to be, once the land was acquired, a plan for its use. This too ought to be related

back to state and local plans, for the reason that I mentioned, so that the reservoirs could be related to the development of plans for the development of the region.

In the early days this was kind of a new idea and it wasn't too readily accepted within TVA. So we were merely one of the divisions making recommendations. But then, as I recall, I would say in maybe the late forties we had a program that came under administrative code 6-0 and what this was was a kind of coordinating process to see if from all of the divisions we couldn't come up with a general plan for the development of reservoirs' shorelines after we knew what land we had acquired. I think this was the start of and the first break-through in the terms of formal planning for the use of shorelines within Tennessee, along the Tennessee River and along the reservoirs themselves. This sort of program continued over the years and I, of course, was with the Community and Regional Planning group for all these periods. And what we were trying to do at the same time was to work with the state planning agencies [with] whom we had very close working relationships and through them with the community planning groups which we had encouraged. (I'd like to talk about that a little later on.) Out of this our whole concept was: Can we come up with a plan for the development of the reservoir shoreline that is consistent with TVA objectives and yet is also consistent with the plans of the states and of the localities? I think in general we were fairly successful with this. But I should say one of the real problems was there was never, in our opinion, enough planning prior to land acquisition. We ended up taking whatever land had been acquired and then trying to fit it into a plan, except that there were a few key lands developed or purchased for what we then called Programmed

Purposes. The recreation staff would make certain recommendations for community parks and thing of this sort. But there was never any real effort to relate it to industrial development and other kinds of usage.

This kind of a program continued and our staff was largely responsible for preparing those plans over the years. But, I think, the second major break-through came with Melton Hill Reservoir. This was almost by accident because we were planning for Melton Hill Reservoir and had been working with the state planning agencies and the local planning agencies on the plans for that reservoir. It just happened that Congress refused to appropriate funds for Melton Hill and that the construction could not start. This meant that we had a whole extra year to put the general land-use plan together prior to the approval of the project and prior to any acquisition of land. As a result of that the plan that came up was not only thoroughly coordinated within TVA but represented the thinking of Oak Ridge, Knox County, and the state. We did have a basic plan on which to base land acquisition, and it was the first time that we started using the general land-use plan as a basis for both land acquisition and for the road relocations.

Of course, you know the real test of that came later on in Tellico when the plan really became the basis for the total land acquisition and for the road relocation project in which we used the road relocation monies to build a whole new regional road system in cooperation with the state. There has been, during the period that I was with TVA, a very broad evolution of planning of reservoir shorelines from kind of piecemeal sort of planning to the development of general plans after the fact and then to the development of plans for reservoirs prior to the appropriation and prior to construction so that these plans can be used both

for acquisition of land, road relocations and the other kinds of development problems associated with reservoirs. Because the thing that certainly must be obvious in this day and age is you can't control the land along the shoreline unless you have two things: 1. You have some way to control the land use. 2. You have support from the local people. I think our relationships in the planning areas and with the planning agencies gave the kind of local support we were talking about and the acquisition of the key lands was one means that we could really be assured of the control of the use of those lands.

I think as Mr. Wagner has pointed out many times, it is very difficult for us to understand why a few landowners should recapture the increase in value that was created by the public monies. I think that TVA and Mr. Wagner particularly, who sponsored the policy, believed that if the public was to make an investment in the land at least it ought to be a way for the public to recoup part of the incremental increase in value resulting from that public investment. So this is what has happened on my recent lakes.

So I think, this too has been an interesting history about TVA. I'd like to also talk about because I have also mentioned this already, our relationship with state and local planning agencies. I want to mention them from a couple points of view: 1. The whole general philosophy behind it, [and] 2. that program that was initiated by TVA became the basis for what was later incorporated in the Housing Act of 1954 as Section 701 of the Housing Act.

I suppose you would have to say that the whole general philosophy for the work that we did with planning agencies went back to H.A. Morgan. One of my TVA friends, a couple of years before I retired, gave me a

copy of a memorandum that was written by H.A. in 1933, and it was right after the Board was organized. I do not know the exact date, but if you are interested in it you can look in the book that is written by George Gordon, the dissertation by George Gordon. I gave him a copy of it and I think he included it in there. But in this memorandum H.A. was trying to establish a policy and philosophy for working with people of the Valley. And it was out of this philosophy that the whole idea was developed that TVA should not try to take over all these new programs, but that we should work with the people of the Valley and that we should work within the framework of these institutions. And I know others have criticized this. I'm not so sure that you accomplish all that much by knocking down what formerly existed rather than building on the strength of those institutions. So this is exactly what we did with the local planning assistance programs.

In trying to work with the states and with localities in terms of setting up planning organizations, TVA first of all went to the states and tried to encourage them to establish a state planning agency. Here in Tennessee (let's see who was the governor at that time--1935.)

DR. CRAWFORD: That would have been, let's see, Hill McAlister.

MR. GRAY: McAlister--Governor McAlister was the one who set up that original organization--I think it was called the Tennessee Valley Commission. But the whole idea was that by working with TVA and with the whole state we could come up with joint programs. Out of this came the Tennessee State Planning legislation in which Tennessee actually paid for the consulting services of Alfred Betman, who was hired to come down and to work in Tennessee and to produce state planning legislation. This included planning and enabling

legislation for localities and zoning power, subdivision control and other things. Actually, in 1935 Governor McAlister did take this as part of his program and it was pushed through that year and this became the basis for what became very famous throughout the United States, the program for state planning carried out by the Tennessee State Planning Commission for many years.

I think this is illustrative of the way we had tried to work in the Valley. We would never go into a community unless we had checked it out with the Tennessee State Planning Commission and they in fact wanted to go in there and work with that community with us. We would then assign staff people to work with us and them and we would also go to planning commission meetings, help them to organize local planning agencies throughout the Valley.

You must remember that in 1935 when this program started there were only one or two local planning commissions in the whole valley. I remember there was one in Memphis, one in Knoxville--Harland-Bartholomew had done an awful lot of work in this area--he was a private consultant. He did the first plan for Knoxville, which was done in 1930. Then there was a general plan for Memphis that Bartholomew did, although there had been some other kinds of planning activitiy. Johnson City was a planned town. John Knoland was the planner there. As a matter of fact, Earl Draper, who was the head of the old Land Planning & Housing Division, had worked with Knoland in Johnson City and, of course, he also laid out Sequoyah Hills here in Knoxville in some of the early planning efforts. But when you came to the small community usually there had been

no planning activity.

So it was during this whole period that we started to organize planning commissions in small towns throughout the Valley. I should say too that one of the innovations I think of that program was while we had some staff people that could be available for this type of work TVA signed contracts with both Tennessee and Alabama for technical planning and assistance to reservoir affected communities. Under these contracts the state was to hire professional planners. They were to work in the communities that were affected for good or bad by the reservoirs--help them in their readjustment. They were to make this information on local planning and how it was to be carried out available to communities throughout the state. So I feel that these were responsible and very obviously that they were for the starting of the local planning assistance programs that were so effective in the Valley states. I think it is to TVA's credit that we didn't insist that this program be carried on only within the TVA area, because I think that most of our people understood if these were in fact going to be state programs they had to be statewide. They had to be institutionalized so they were statewide. So in both Tennessee and Alabama where most of the TVA work was there were established some very effective local planning assistance programs.

I should say that in the Alabama program I was loaned to the state to help them set up their planning assistance program and I worked throughout that whole area of North Alabama helping to organize planning programs in such towns as Guntersville, and the little town of Madison (I never will forget working in there.) Decatur, Alabama--that was a great experience because those people were really civic-minded and wanted to build up that community. Also in the Muscle Shoals area--Florence, Sheffield, Tuscumbia and Muscle Shoals City--these were all towns that

were started during those early days of TVA, beginning, I guess, around 1938,'39,'40.

So this was the way the planning program was started. I should say we also worked in Kentucky, North Carolina, and Virginia, but we had some fairly difficult problems in some of these states. In Virginia for example, the attitude was that anything that the federal government did, and TVA represented the federal government, was essentially wrong, so therefore they didn't want to cooperate with us. We still worked with them on the reservoirs in that area. North Carolina had much the same problem, but I should say here that TVA was in large measure responsible for the successful establishment of the School of Planning at North Carolina. Jack Park who interned with us before he took on the responsibility, was in North Carolina--really alone, the only faculty member they had for establishing that school. TVA realized that if there was to be any kind of planning activities throughout the area there had to be trained technicians, and it was for this reason they gave financial support to that. The way we arranged this was we arranged for the school to employ another professor to help in the school, but he was also working in western North Carolina during the summer and so many days a week to assist the communities in that part of the state affected primarily by Fontana Dam. I guess it was 1942 about that time when we were building that reservoir. Jim Webb, who had been employed by the university, worked in western North Carolina while he taught at the university. So I feel that TVA made a major contribution to the establishment of the Graduate School of Planning at North Carolina.

We did more than that--we became a source for internships for their students. We helped on their theses for them and we always had close ties with North Carolina. As a matter of fact, the man who suceeded me, Jim Gober here in TVA, is a North Carolina graduate as are a couple of others on the regional planning staff from North Carolina. So there always have been close ties with North Carolina.

In Kentucky there was only such a small part of the Tennessee Valley within Kentucky that we had difficulty really establishing a strong base for working relationships with the state of Kentucky. We did however, plan with them on Grand Rivers and several other developmental problems along that short stretch of Kentucky reservoir that is in the state.

Georgia and Mississippi--I can't say we ever did establish good working relationships with those states. I think the basis was they never did have what I would consider a sound planning program or a local planning assistance program of any caliber. While we worked with them when we could there was never a sound basis for working with them. I think this was unfortunate particularly in Mississippi. As you know the power service area in Mississippi covers about a third of the state at least. And this was a very rapidly developing part of the state, and one that needed heavy infusion of some kind of planning assistance.

DR. CRAWFORD: Do you say that TVA was responsible mainly for the development of planning agencies in these states?

MR. GRAY: Yes, I would say that particularly in Tennessee and Alabama. Now in the other states as the years went by we started working with the National Resources Planning Board to encourage[them]. They helped also to set up the planning agencies in the other Valley states. In Tennessee and Alabama where most of the

TVA activities were--this is largely the result of the TVA effort.

Let me make one of my observations. I guess it must have been around 1951, 1952, or 1953, that Carl Feiss was working with what was then the old Housing and Home Financing Agency. He was a planner and he too was interested in this experience that we had had in Tennessee by providing funds for the local planning assistance to the state planning agency. So Carl started touring this section of the country--Alabama and particularly Tennessee. I guess it would have to be 1953, or '52--one of those years. I do remember the meeting was held in Johnson City. Maybe Harold Miller has recorded this if you will talk with him. I remember I was at that meeting, Harold was there, Carl Feiss was there. The purpose of the meeting was to give Carl an insight into some of the policies that TVA had followed as well as the policies that the state planning commission here in Tennessee had followed in providing technical planning assistance to localities. Now what Carl was interested in doing was to make this a national program. He actually did succeed in getting this into the legislation and so that as I mentioned earlier in the Housing Act of 1954. There was this section "701" which in fact provided for planning assistance to localities and it provided funds that should go to the state agencies from the federal government and they in turn would provide either through the funds going directly to consultants or they would provide help directly to a local community.

I think this was a really important program because you must remember that particularly here in the South and really in the nation as a whole we were finally realizing that we were an urban nation and we had to

to act differently than when we were an agricultural nation. The urban problems were upon us and this was becoming the habitat for most of the people living in the country and it had to be a different approach than the haphazard kind of urban development that had happened heretofore.

Let me make one other observation while I am on this tool while it relates to some of the broad policy issues. In working with communities TVA tended to give preference to the small community. While we did help in the larger cities this was more in the nature of general consultations. The real technical assistance went to the smaller communities. I should say that this not only applied to technical planning assistance but to assistance in industrial development and in nearly all kinds of technical assistance.

DR. CRAWFORD: Why did TVA make that distinction? Did they feel the larger communities could take care of themselves?

MR. GRAY: Yes. I don't think we really understood what we were really doing and the significance of what we were doing in those early days. But by the late fifies it became very evident that unless we found ways to stabilize the development in localities--smaller localities--that many of them were going to become ghost towns or were going to decline and become stagnant communities. This is when I think we started emphasizing industrial development, more particularly industrial development in smaller communities. TVA tried to use its staff as a means of equalizing some of the technical skills that were in the big cities and not available in the small cities and the work that Mike Foster did, I think, there is a good illustration of that of helping the smaller cities have access to the review and study techniques that would normally be available only to large cities. But I

think to TVA's credit we helped these small communities at least solve some of their physical problems through the planning programs and I am certain we helped them solve some of their economic problems by encouraging industrial development within these communities, helping the communities to provide intra-structure for them, helping them to organize the industrial districts. And as you know the year that I retired, 1973, if I remember the figures correctly, that in that particular year 55% of the total new industrial jobs in the Valley came in the smaller communities. While everybody bemoans a smaller community unless you can make it economically a viable place the small community can't survive. While it is very nice to be nostalgic about those communities--small community--the real fact is in this present day and age unless you make it also economically feasible it cannot survive. I think TVA in large measure was one of the key factors in helping the small communities of this Valley be economically viable and able to adjust to the changing world.

THIS IS THE ORAL HISTORY RESEARCH OFFICE OF MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY. THIS PROJECT IS THE "ORAL HISTORY OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY." THE DATE IS DECEMBER 20, 1974. THE PLACE IS KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE. THE INTERVIEW IS WITH MR. A.J. GRAY FORMERLY WITH TVA. THE INTERVIEW IS BY DR. CHARLES W. CRAWFORD, THE DIRECTOR OF THE ORAL HISTORY RESEARCH OFFICE OF MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY. TRANSCRIBED BY BETTY WILLIAMS. INTERVIEW # 2.

DR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Gray, let's us continue with the material that we had started in the first interview.

MR. GRAY: Well, let's talk a little bit about work in new towns. Let me talk a little bit about Norris. In my opinion, Norris is a very crucial part of the history of TVA. Until a few years ago when I started doing a little research on Norris I didn't realize that the idea for the town of Norris probably came from FDR himself. Certainly he had been thinking of, how do you adjust rural America to what he saw as most certainly the growing of industrialization in American cities. How do you help people with the transition? And he had some ideas that there ought to be some rural communities established that could kind of become training centers for people who are coming off the farms. They could work on the farms part-time, but they could also learn new trades and new skills. As you go back into the record, and I found some TVA memos about this by the way, it became very clear that even before the board was appointed, A.E. Morgan, and the President Franklin Roosevelt, had talks about maybe

trying to build a town that would do these sorts of things. These memos also would make it kind of clear that FDR didn't want another back to the farm sort of movement because he knew this would not be successful and so he wanted a small experiment some place to get it started and on the basis of this maybe develop it into a national program.

So the original concept of Norris was that it would be an agricultural community in which the people who ere working on the dam and TVA only had a five-hour work period in order to spread the employment. The theory was that men with their families would come and live in Norris, would work on the dam and in various kinds of skills--learning poultry farming, other kinds of agricultural and skilled development--wood working and things of this sort. The idea developed to use Norris as this experiment and so that the Corps of Engineers made the original estimate on Norris and they included a million and five or a million three for a temporary temporary camp there for the workers. So FDR had created the subsistence farmsteads, I believe it was, and the way this was supposed to be arranged was that TVA would use the million three that they had for the construction village and subsistence farms would put in the rest of the money necessary to make it a permanent village.

A.E. was the real supporter of the town of Norris. Very early in the game as a matter of fact--early in 1933, right after Earl Draper came, his first assignment was to find a site for the town. And it was to be the kind of town that I mentioned to you. H.A. [Morgan] went out and looked at the area for agricultural land--if it was good agricul-

tural land and all of this sort of thing. About this time Lilienthal came on the scene, of course. It became very evident at that early stage that the personalities of these two were in conflict and I found this one memo that came from Lilienthal to A.E. in which he challenged the whole idea of Norris--very sharply worded memorandum to A.E. A. E. responded in an equally sharply worded memo in which he defended the town and its purposes. As a matter of fact, if it hadn't been for A.E. I don't think that town ever would have been built. He defended it, he talked about it, he got support where ever he could, and I am sure it was over Lilienthal's objections. Because Lilienthal, regardless of what he writes in a book, was kind of a narrow guy. He was interested in power operations and all the rest were frills, in my opinion. (Of course, everybody has their own opinion, you know.) A.E. was the one who saw TVA in the very broadest of aspects. He saw TVA as a broad regional planning and TVA might have been a different agency if he had had his way in certain things. It would have been a much broader agency and wouldn't have been limited the way it has been to its kind of operations over all.

To make a long story short, apparently there was change in the policies to the subsistence homesteads group so they withdrew and this meant that TVA had to rejustify this new community if they were going to build it. About this time they had hired Tracy B. Augur, who was a Cornell graduate and was one of that kind of select group of people who ere in the Regional Planning Association of America (I think that's the name of it.) This is a group of people made up of Clarence Stein, Henry Wright, all of the real early planners in this country, the architect planner background who are interested in regional planning, interested in new

town. And it was through this experience that Tracy knew Stein's and Wright's work in Radburn. He knew of the new town work in England so Tracy was brought down to design the new town. Well, he came on the scene about the time that the subsistence farmstead group pulled out of the project. So the justification had to be rebuilt. It became a demonstration in new town development from the old idea of education, agriculture shilted to the idea of new town in pretty much the traditional English new town theory.

It was the first new town in United State that had a green belt around it and it preceeded the Green Belt towns built by the Resettlement Administration, as a matter of fact. And in the history of new town development in this country, Norris actually stands between Radburn, New Jersey, which was designed by Stein and Wright and the Resettlement Administration Green Belt towns which were built as Green Dale, Green Hills, and Green Belt, Maryland. So here Tracy started building into this kind of free flowing new town that as a demonstration of new town practice in the United States.

I think some interesting things happened because in 1935, I found a memorandum--unbelievably it was about a 150 pages long memorandum. (If you can imagine a memorandum 150 pages long written by log as a matter of fact.) What they were doing was saying in essense, if you are going to build this town, the only way it can really become a successful experiment is that it be built as a regular ongoing Tennessee community. They advocated very strongly that we get special legislation to permit its incorporation as a Tennessee community. Well I think the planners, (and I certainly would have been one of those if I had been working on it at that time which I wasn't 'cause I was out in the field

as you know, I was working on the RLCS,) the planners felt to have a successful new town experiment you had to have absolute control of the land, that you would never sell the land. As a matter of fact, the land would always remain as communal property, that the houses would be kind of ground leases on this. So TVA, as a matter of policy, decided not to sell the town. But there came the problem of how do you get democratic control in a company-owned town? And so as construction declined on the dam this meant that other white collar workers would have to move in, and some people working in Knoxville who actually lived out there, and finally Forrestry moved out there, and it became a little employment base for the town.

TVA set up a citizens group in Norris. This was to be a group that was to represent citizens' interest in management of the town. Almost from the very beginning there was conflict between the two, and this becomes obvious. The residents are interested in low rents and high services and the same way everybody is--no one wants to pay very many taxes to get them. So I suppose the people living in Norris were just ordinarily reacting in the way that everybody would react. But this forced a conflict between TVA and the citizens of the town. This went on for years and years and years. While TVA was trying to bend over backwards to solve the problem, and I think the citizens of the town were also trying to do the same, these differences of interest really couldn't be resolved.

The war came and TVA was forced by Congress to get rid of the operation of the school, which was a real innovation in community schools

and which was one of the reasons why most of the people liked to live there because it was a school of very high quality. So,then finally after the war, the whole issue was reopened again and TVA was just really put right in the middle because they couldn't get money for maintaining the town. There were demands on the city by the citizens for expanded services and finally Congress in 1947 said that TVA when they came back for their next budget they had to have a plan for either making the town self-sufficient or dispose of the town. This is what TVA had to do, finally decided to dispose of the town, and they did that in 1948.

This raised some interesting policy questions, by the way, while some of the current staff people I know like to say that there is only one policy in TVA, as you know, within any staff organization there are a lot of conflicting opinions and points of view that have to be reconciled one way or the other. When Norris was sold there were really two views within TVA. One view, which was represented pretty much by the property management people, was that when TVA sold Norris we had no further interest in it--absolutely no further interest--that we were done with it and we would treat it just like any other community. Some of the rest of us had a little different view. We held to the view that no matter what TVA did they couldn't divorce themselves from Norris. They built it, it was their brain child and what happened in Norris would be reflected on TVA as a detriment or as a benefit to TVA. So there were some of us that held to the view that our relationships with Norris should be carried on with the view that I have just expressed in mind.

You know, as must happen, there is a compromise down the line, so

for example, we did say in our brochure advertising the town for sale that it had a protective watershed. The lawyers maintained that we had to provide permanent protection to that watershed so TVA made the watershed available to the community. We didn't, however, and I think this was a great and tragic mistake, turn over the Green Belt to the municipality. The municipality had to buy all of the utilities, and it didn't have the money itself and even though, I remember, we made a very attractive price for the whole Green Belt to the city, they just felt they couldn't afford it. I was out there a few weeks ago giving a talk and I think the present administration regrets that they never did buy that land because they would like to have it as a buffer with all the developments that are occurring out there at the present time. But anyway I think the point is that Norris has grown. Norris has had the strong planning tradition and it has maintained the kind of character over these years and, in my opinion, is one of the most successful of the small planned towns in the United States. It has got an operating budget, a lot of citizen participation, and has got a good environment for living. From this point of view, I think in spite of the problems that TVA had, it was a worthy experiment.

This brings us of course, to this whole issue of what I think is a major problem in TVA and that is the place of TVA in the whole federal system. Just as an observer over the years it seems to me to have plagued us all of these years. I say this because the whole justification for TVA, it seems to me, is that of a regional planning and development agency. I know a lot of my TVA friends would cut out the word planning, but you at least have to know your mission before you can develop that mission. So I would say it has to be a regional planning and a development agency. I do not believe it can do this unless it is recognized

at the national level as performing these functions. It cannot merely carry on programs of local planning assistance and call this a regional planning program. I have maintained this.

With most of the regional planning that is going on in this country everybody thinks that by carrying or a program of planning assistance that you automatically are doing regional planning. I don't think this is true. I think the regional planning that's done in the Tennessee Valley is done in terms of the regional wide facilities and programs which are developed at the regional scale. So I think that TVA's problem is that it has not been able to do the variety of things necessary to respond to the requirements of the changing region. I don't think that this is necessarily TVA's fault as the fact that Congress and the big departments have just never recognized TVA as a regional development agency. So when we start moving in the direction of trying to find new ways to solve regional problems, particualarly in the urban field, where I was involved you run right up against: "Well, if you are going to do this, what is HUD supposed to be doing". So we have opposition to many things.

A good illustration of this is Timberlake. Here I am not talking about the controversy of Tellico, which is another matter which I could talk at length about. But Tellico is a concept that is entirely different one, because the whole Tellico concept initially was built upon the idea: How do you organize for urban growth so that you avoid some of the sprawl that you have in the metropolitan areas, and how do you organize urban growth so that you can respond to the industrial and economic and social needs of the day? Contrary to what some of the environmnetal people are now saying, Timberlake was never conceived

as an elitest community with golf courses and this sort of thing. Although there would be some houses there for high income people, the whole concept was (it was a position that our whole section took all along) that unless you could develop housing for low income people in that community and provide a level of services for people with modest incomes, TVA really shouldn't be in this program.

Now the whole concept here was: How does a public agency and private enterprise work together to build a new town? Sooner or later the nation is going to have to face some of these urban policy questions and urban development issues which they haven't seen fit to do as yet. One of these, of course, is the trying to develop new towns on a sufficient scale and with some kind of system so that we don't continue to build the Los Angeles and the New York State cities which are probably ungovernable and probably have reached such a size that they are virtually impossible to service.

So one of the ideas in back of Timberlake was that here by TVA buying the land and doing some of the preliminary studies and then by joining with a master developer we could provide some of the front-end costs and front-end expenses that make it almost impossible for a private entrepreneur to build an effective new town. Of course, the environmentalist in their zeal forget that there are people living on this earth sometimes and that we must find solutions to our urban problems if we are going to find solutions to the preservation of the natural landscape because it is all (I of course, am one that believes we live in an urban world) and our solutions must be in the form of those kinds of programs which are representative of an urban world. It is not 1850 anymore; we don't cut our hay with a scythe. All I am saying is, it is a pretty highly technical world and if the pro-

blems aren't going to be solved in that way they probably won't be solved at all.

So the problem that TVA faces is this one of continuing to establish itself as a regional agency and one who is responsible for experimentation in regional developmental programs that help to solve these kinds of programs and then pass on to other kinds of activities. Unless it is able to do this, I think it will be under increasing attack because, as I said before, merely assistance to localities on a series of miscellaneous programs is not in my opinion a regional program.

I'd like to talk about one other problem that I experienced being in middle management for so many years, and particularly later years. I must admit I am subject to some frustrations probably in my own inadequacy, because I was getting older and I couldn't adjust as well as I could in the earlier days. TVA has always credited itself with decentralized administration. It has given them all kinds of power and control to the individual divisions.

Here I am talking from the point of view of my observation (which may or may not be a valid one). I think it is important to understand that when the initial program of decentralized administration developed, the TVA mission was clear-cut, and everybody knew and understood what it was. We had to develop the river. We had to relate the river to the region. And I think the need for strong decentralized planning with broad policy guidelines set, at least as the mission became clear was really not too important because we were already in the act and everybody understood it. But after 1955, I did think TVA changed significantly because we had built the major components of the river system and the question that TVA faced was: What is our mission in the region? I do not think TVA has solved that basic policy question and I would con-

tend that the decentralized administration is one of the reasons it has never been able to do this because it has never been able to establish strong centralized planning to provide the kind of guidelines and to provide the kind of mission guidance that I think it absolutely necessary in this kind of situation. I don't think you build this kind of a program from the ground up. Here I know there will be others in TVA that will disagree with this.

I do not think the great autonomy of the departments is appropriate under present situations as it was under the pre-1955 situation. I suspect that most new people who are now coming in do not understand this--what I am talking about--the early conditions which made the decentralized administration possible. And yet it has now become a kind of idealogy. Really it may not be appropriate to the times or may not be as suited to the present day needs. I know the real dangers in this because you can have too greatly centralized administration and therefore frustrate the initiative at the operating level. But for one who has been at Middle Management and I 've talked to a lot TVA Middle Management people I am sure they feel the same way at this point in time. They really do not feel that they have the kind of policy guidance and they are guessing all the time as to what the policy is rather than in fact knowing whast those policies are. So I think this is a really major problem TVA faces and maybe some of the new people coming into TVA will be able to do this. I don't think the kind of planning that is going one now is the kind that is going to solve this particular problem.

Well so much of that--let me talk about one thing. We are kind of running out of time here. Let me talk about one other program that became a national program that I was heavily involved in. That is the TVA program of flood damage prevention. I think it is an interesting program and I think it is interesting because TVA was the first one to make a long-standing idea work.

I guess TVA's concern for this problem really began--oh, I don't know when it was--I'd say probably in the middle fifties. At that time Water Control Planning came out with a report in which it listed maybe 100-150 cities in the Valley and it tried to analyze the flood problems they had in these small cities. As you would go down through this list you would see "no action taken because project cannot be justified." So some in TVA said, "What do we do? Wait around till a development occurred in the area subject to floods so that we can then justify some flood control work or do we say there is such a thing as flood damage prevention as had been advocated by many people--flood plain zoning, the use of police power to control developments in the area?"

So our little group at least started an idea that why don't we try to build within TVA a program of assistance for flood damage prevention. I have to say here that since I am not an engineer I don't have all that good rapport with the engineers because they felt that I wasn't qualified to deal with flood data, and they are probably right, but I did know something about land use and land use control. It was about this time that, I think it was Mr. Wagner, who talked Jim Goddard into heading up a program of flood damage prevention here in TVA. This started an association between Jim and myself that really developed the whole idea and concept of the TVA program which ultimately

became the national program. Jim had worked in Hydraulic Data and Water Control Planning and so they knew and respected Him. He had access to all the materials and he knew what the data contained. I guess I brought to it an understanding of zoning, local planning, land-use control. And so out of this came the idea that why not work with the state planning agencies and through them with local agencies, starting first with an appraisal of data on flood conditions in various communities, and try to build this into the planning program.

So we started off with him pulling together materials that would give the historic record of floods on the streams within the area. Then we came on to the question of (here of course is where the engineers were actually right about my using the data because I didn't understand one point very well) that even though there is a fairly long record, there is no assurance that record represents even what could be approaching a maximum porbable flood. So Jim, who was familiar with this, was able to do the data problem much better than I would have been able to.

Out of this Jim worked out the concept of regional flood. Now regional flood was something lower than the maximum probable flood, but was a flood that was based on the heaviest rains that had occurred within a fifty mile radius of a particular point. And it was kind of an intermediate sort of flood elevation, but it wasn't the maximum probable that from land use control point of view became an impossible elevation to get peopel to try to adhere and not to build into. This would mean, you know, that you don't build in an area where you are likely to have a flood every thousand years. I admit, you know, that you could have that

flood next year, but at least at the upper limits there you were getting a little bit beyond the test of reasonableness that you were going to have to sustain under zoning. We started using this regional elevation and in some cases we dropped this down in later years particularly to the 100 year flood.

So from this Jim started working with the communities and I started working with him. We gave talks all over the Valley. We gave national talks. We went to a lot of the planning conferences, and got a lot of interest stirred up in the whole program. Ultimately, I suggest TVA provide data to I'd say nearly every community of any size and get them to at least consider in one way or another how the flood problem did affect their local plans. I think there was a major break-through in this whole effort in the Valley. I think it was a substantial and important addition in terms of a regional program to the whole flood program of the Valley. As you know, eventually this was adopted by the Corps and is now a continuing nation-wide program. So I think here again where we have been able to demonstrate regional programs, it goes back to the point I was making a moment ago: If we (TVA) can do those things that demonstrate benefits and can be experimental in terms of the region as a regional development agency then I think its role, if it is recognized as that, can be sustained. Well that is about it. I don't know if you want to talk about some other ideas, I'd be glad to do this.

DR. CRAWFORD: I can ask many questions, Mr. Gray. Let me limit to just a few for I know your time is perhaps gone. Do you think that TVA has ever been close to finding another mission after

developing the river?

MR. GRAY: No, I do not. I do not. I think in large measure the reason it hasn't because of the image in Congress particularly that TVA has as a water and a power agency. I'm not saying that TVA views itself on the inside as that. I'm saying--I am talking about exterior forces. So when you go for these other kinds of missions you are going head-on into some of the activities of the bigger departments. Let me give you one other reason why TVA is having such a difficult problem, in my opinion again.

In the early days you remember the federal budget did not concern itself with the grants and aids to the states. Therefore the early TVA construction program was in fact a kind of federal fiscal impact on this region, and it did have significant impacts. But with the coming of the beg grant programs, how was TVA to compete and in what form. Was it to compete when you had the HUD programs moving into the area, when you had the big highway programs moving in, all kinds of health programs moving into the field, and all the grant and aid programs? So unless TVA could have found some kind of a mission that would be in this frame of competition, I think it is going to have a very difficult time establishing that mission.

DR. CRAWFORD: TVA's original mission, it seems to me, was sold to the Congress and the people quite easily because it dealt with a severe and obvious problem, however, the nation would uphold anyone and since it could be solved and after that TVA could turn, if another mission did not appear, into a maintenance agency I suppose.

MR. GRAY: Going back to this point, during the time that

Gant was General Manager, I don't know if you have run into this or not, but the question of whether or not TVA should continue was actually raised administratively within TVA because we were faced with this very problem that I told about: That TVA may should be disbanded, maybe TVA should be considered as a temporary sort of thing as a temporary agency once it got the region on its feet. Maybe it ought to back off.

DR. CRAWFORD: Well, TVA has always been it seems to me, outside of the main structure of American government.

MR. GRAY: That's right.

DR. CRAWFORD: Because of being rather unique. It is essentially a regional organization, it does not have regional counterparts, anywhere else and you have national programs that cut across it.(TVA)

MR. GRAY: That's right.

DR. CRAWFORD: And TVA is somewhere in between.

MR. GRAY: That's right. If I can just philosophize a little right here, the problem that TVA has is not much different from the problem that most of the regional agencies have. Let's take on a smaller scale. Let's take the sub-state districts in Tennessee. Now the same thing that I am telling you about Tennessee applies equally to those: What is their role? How do they relate to local government? How do they relate to state government? These issues have not been settled in terms of those sub-districts. I know the governor created them because it was the fashionable thing to do. I don't know if the governor recog-

nized it, but what they were doing was giving the big federal agencies a big client base without going to the states. That was essentially what HUD was after and that was essentially what ARC was after and that was what EDA was after. They didn't want to go through the states. They wanted a client base out in the communities and they used these regions for that client base. TVA tried to do this with their watersheds, as you know. But this does not solve the mission. ARC is going around and getting the political support for the ARC program, but that doesn't define the mission. You can skip political support but as I say it doesn't clartfy or define that mission. I think what TVA ought to have is a central planning staff that could do that mission-defining and try to find out and a little more specifically what the mission is other than being innovative.

DR. CRAWFORD: It seems to me a great deal of TVA activity since somewhere in the thirties has been an attempt to assign different things to do without a clear focus.

MR. GRAY: You see prior to '55 there was a clear focus. We were developing the river. The focus was: How do we relate in all of its aspects.

DR. CRAWFORD: What date did you give?

MR. GRAY: Nineteen hundred fifty-five. How do we relate in all of its aspects--the river to the development of the rest of the region. Now this was a broad problem I don't think we ever did address. I never did get anybody really interested in it: How do you relate navigation, for example, to highways, to railroads, and to air as a total transportation system for the Valley. Now a lot of people felt that this was kind of a foolhardy thing to do because the whole

transportation system was set by the rate structure established at the national level. I'm not sure that I agreed with this. As a regional agency it seemed to me that we could have established our role as trying to guide a total transportation system rather than merely being concerned with navigation. This would be my point of view. And you know strangely enough I have a feeling after going back and reading a little more of the history that if A.E. hadn't been so righteous in his point of view that he had God on his side and everybody else didn't, that A.E. might have moved TVA more in that direction. Certainly Lilienthal wasn't going to.

DR. CRAWFORD: Into developing the resources of a region?

MR. GRAY: Yes. As a whole in viewing that as a total concept rather than a piecemeal concept of merely trying to find things to do.

DR. CRAWFORD: Or as relating specifically to power production.

MR. GRAY: Yes, that is right. I think A.E. would have done this. Certianly if you go back and look at some of the early memos and early talks that he gave, you find more of this represented in his view of things than you did in either the H.A. Morgan people, which is essentially the old extension service, or the legal production view that Lilienthal had, although he adopted the grassroots thing, I think, as a gimmick for him. I don't think he was all that democratic myself.

DR. CRAWFORD: Well perhaps it was an operational decision.

MR. GRAY: Yes. These are problems that, by the way, have you ever talked Lawrence Durisch?

DR. CRAWFORD: Yes, I interviewed him down at the University of

Tennessee about two years ago.

MR. GRAY: Yes. I hope that he talked. Lawrence in my opinion is the one that you ought to really have been talking to about the role of TVA in this whole governmental federal structure because Lawrence, if anybody in all the TVA history, has a sense of this, I think Lawrence has it. He is a political scientist, as you know, and a very, very thoughtful person on this whole philosophic problem. And I think if anybody has a feel for this Lawrence was with TVA right from the beginning and I think he felt very keenly about this particular aspect of the problem and I hope that was in his review.

DR. CRAWFORD: We had very good interviews and we may need to talk further.

MR. GRAY: Yes, I think Lawrence is the one that could give you that. Well,I enjoyed the interview.

DR. CRAWFORD: Thank you, sir.

HECKMAN
BINDERY INC.
AUG 88
N. MANCHESTER,
INDIANA 46962